

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uxpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FE	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,833 08/06/2003		08/06/2003	Toshinao Arai	8067-1001 \$616	
466	7590	06/15/2005		EXAMINER	
YOUNG &			LECHERT IR, STEPHEN I		
2ND FLOOR				ART UNIT	· PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTO	N, VA 2	22202	1732		

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/634,833	ARAI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	-	Stephen J. Lechert Jr.	1732			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	·				
THE N - Exten after 3 - If the - If NO - Failur Any re earne	PREPLY CONTROL STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Is sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing id patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a) <u>□</u> 3) <u>□</u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 3-17 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application	on Papers					
10)🖾 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 August 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				

48

Application/Control Number: 10/634,833 Page 2

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 2 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 12-15 of copending Application No. 10/720,537.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications claim casting a dope on a support, and separates the film from the support or die lip end using force. Although, the '537 does not recite using specific force, the '537 applicant recites a method of stripping the film

Application/Control Number: 10/634,833 Page 3

Art Unit: 1732

from the support, and obviously the stripping would be broad enough to encompass using force to remove the film from the support or the die lip end as claimed.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1, 2 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 18, 22, 25 and 27 of copending Application No.

10/657,090. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications claim casting and separating a dope from a support or die lip end, but in the '090 application, the step of removing the dope from the support or die lip ends is accomplished by stripping or separating and to specify using a specific force for removing the dope would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in art where stripping has been generally taught.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/634,833

Art Unit: 1732

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Topolkareb et al. teach a method of casting a film using temperatures lower than zero degrees centigrade, but does not teach the dope with the polymer and solvent as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Lechert Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1203. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/634,833

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen J. Lechert Jr.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1732